



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

Theses and Dissertations

Thesis Collection

1991-09

The optimal force mix and allocation of fires for the future field artillery

Page, John Mann

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/26671>



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



THESIS

THE OPTIMAL FORCE MIX AND
ALLOCATION OF FIRES FOR
THE FUTURE FIELD ARTILLERY

by

John Mann Page

September, 1991

Thesis Advisor:
Co - Advisor:

LCDR William Walsh
LTC William Caldwell

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 55		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, CA 93943-5000			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, CA 93943-5000		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)				10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		Program Element No.		Project No.	Task No.
					Work Unit Accession Number
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) THE OPTIMAL FORCE MIX AND ALLOCATION OF FIRES FOR THE FUTURE FIELD ARTILLERY					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Page, John M.					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Master's Thesis		13b. TIME COVERED From To		14. DATE OF REPORT (year, month, day) September 1991	
				15. PAGE COUNT 88	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUBGROUP	Artillery, Fire Support, AirLand Operations, Mixed Integer Linear Programming		
19. ABSTRACT (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The new Army warfighting doctrine, AirLand Operations, is designed for the army of the 90s, a smaller army, but one which will be faced with global responsibilities. These responsibilities will range from fighting wars and regional conflicts, to conducting various peacetime operations in support of allies in the realm of Low Intensity Conflict. Our success under AirLand Operations will largely depend upon the ability of the Field Artillery to disrupt enemy C3 elements, and destroy troop formations from extended ranges early in the battle. The Artillery School (USAFAS), is currently developing several advanced systems to accomplish this mission. The focus of this thesis is the Artillery Attack Model (AAM). The AAM is a GAMS Mixed Integer Linear Programming model developed to assist USAFAS determine the Minimum Cost Weapon / Munition Mix and Allocation of fires to targets in order to meet the commander's kill criteria on the future battlefield.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS				21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL LCDR William Walsh				22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area code) (408) 646-3113	
				22c. OFFICE SYMBOL OR/Wa	

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

The Optimal Force Mix and Allocation of Fires
for the Future Field Artillery

by


John Mann Page
Captain, United States Army
B.S., United States Military Academy, 1982

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN OPERATIONS RESEARCH

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 1991



ABSTRACT

The new Army warfighting doctrine, AirLand Operations, is designed for the army of the 90s, a smaller army, but one which will be faced with global responsibilities. These responsibilities will range from fighting wars and regional conflicts, to conducting various peacetime operations in support of allies in the realm of Low Intensity Conflict. Our success under AirLand Operations will largely depend upon the ability of the Field Artillery to disrupt enemy C3 elements, and destroy troop formations from extended ranges early in the battle. The Artillery School (USAFAS) is currently developing several advanced systems to accomplish this mission. The focus of this thesis is the Artillery Attack Model (AAM). The AAM is a GAMS Mixed Integer Linear Programming model developed to assist USAFAS determine the Minimum Cost Weapon/Munition Mix and Allocation of Fires to targets in order to meet the commander's kill criteria on the future battlefield.

106513
2116/15
C.1

THESIS DISCLAIMER

The reader is cautioned that the computer program developed in this research may not have been exercised for all cases of interest. While every effort has been made, within the time available, to ensure that the program is free of computational and logic errors, it cannot be considered validated. Any application of this program without additional verification is at the risk of the user.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	OUR NEW WORLD ORDER	1
1.	Era of Change	1
2.	A New Threat	2
3.	A New National Military Strategy	3
B.	AIRLAND OPERATIONS: OUR NEW DOCTRINE	4
1.	Detection - Preparation	5
2.	Establishing Conditions for Decisive Operations	5
3.	Decisive Operations	5
4.	Reconstitution	5
C.	FIRE SUPPORT IN AIRLAND OPERATIONS	6
D.	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	7
1.	Background: Legal Mix VII Study	7
2.	The Next Generation Artillery Systems	7
3.	Scope and Purpose	8
II.	PROBLEM APPROACH	10
A.	APPROACH TO FORCE COMPOSITION AND ALLOCATION OF FIRES	10
1.	Optimizing Long Range Fires	10

2.	The Deterministic Aggregated Combat Model Approach	12
B.	ASSUMPTIONS AND SIMPLIFICATIONS	18
C.	DATA	19
1.	Source	19
2.	Elements	19
III.	ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL LP FORMULATION	21
A.	INTRODUCTION	21
B.	INDICES	21
1.	Type of Weapon System - w	21
2.	Type of Munition - m	21
3.	Type of Target (Enemy System) - t	22
4.	Battle Time Phase - p	22
5.	Target Range Band - r	23
C.	DATA	23
1.	DISTANCE _t	23
2.	EFFECTS _{w,m,t}	23
3.	FIRERATE _{w,m}	23
4.	KILPERCENT _{t,r}	24
5.	LOSSRATE _{w,m,r}	24
6.	MAXRANGE _{w,m}	24
7.	MOCOST _m	24
8.	MPCOST _m	24
9.	NEWTGTS _{t,p,r}	24

10.	$WOCOSTM_w$	24
11.	$WOCOSTP_w$	24
12.	$WPCOST_w$	24
D.	VARIABLES	25
1.	$EXCESSM_{m,p}$	25
2.	$EXCESSW_{w,p}$	25
3.	$MPROD_{m,p}$	25
4.	$TGTS_{t,p,r}$	25
5.	TOTCOST	25
6.	$WPROD_{w,p}$	25
7.	$X_{w,m,t,p,r}$	25
E.	MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION	26
1.	Objective Function	28
2.	Constraints	30
IV.	APPLICATION OF THE ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL	34
A.	TEST CASE OPERATIONAL SCENARIO	34
B.	TEST CASE INPUT DATA SET	36
1.	Enemy Forces	36
2.	Movement of Enemy Forces	36
3.	Commander's Kill Criteria	37
4.	Artillery Effectiveness	38
5.	Artillery Rate of Fire	39
6.	Artillery Maximum Range	39

7.	Counterfire Rate of Enemy Artillery	40
8.	Weapon Costs	41
9.	Munition Costs	41
C.	MODEL SOLUTION PROCEDURE	42
1.	Applying the General Algebraic Modeling System	42
2.	Applying the Zero/One Optimization Method XMP Solver	42
D.	TEST CASE OUTPUT / RESULTS	42
1.	Part I - Optimal Weapon / Munition Mix	43
2.	Part II - Optimal Target Allocation	45
3.	Part III - Optimal Total Cost	49
4.	Analysis of Model Results	49
V.	CONCLUSIONS	50
A.	SUMMARY	50
B.	RECOMMENDATIONS	50
1.	Suggested Improvements	50
2.	Follow - On Study	52
APPENDIX A.	AAM GAMS PROGRAM	54
APPENDIX B.	AAM TEST CASE GAMS LISTING	61
LIST OF REFERENCES	74

BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	77

I. INTRODUCTION

A. OUR NEW WORLD ORDER

1. Era of Change

Our era has been characterized predominantly by change, which has affected every aspect of our society, including the profession of arms. The three key elements of change which have borne the greatest impact upon our National Military Strategy are: the radical changes in the international political environment, our national fiscal concerns, and the emergence of radically advanced technologies. As a result of the "New World Order" our National Military Strategy must also change.

In the past we lived in a bipolar world dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union. We principally practiced a Military Strategy of Forward Defense of Western Europe in response to the potential threat of nuclear war or High Intensity Conflict with the Warsaw Pact armies. Over the past two years we have witnessed the destruction of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany, as well as the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, and the democratization of the Soviet Union. We have also witnessed the signing of the Conventional Forces Europe (CFE) Treaty and the initial withdrawal of Soviet troops from the region. With the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the breaking-up of the Soviet Union, the Soviets' influence has largely subsided as they turn their focus inward to resolve their own internal political and financial crises. Yet the Soviet Union will continue to be the major military force with which we may have to contend since, despite all of its internal struggles, the Soviet Union continues to modernize both its conventional and nuclear forces, as well as

expand its space based research efforts. However, in light of recent world political developments and Soviet internal problems, the US would face a major Soviet threat in Europe only after a long and visible preparation process.

The United States is also experiencing its own internal crises, specifically it is faced with a budget deficit of monumental proportions. As a result, all branches of government are faced with the difficult task of reducing the government workforce and scaling back funded social and defense programs in an effort to reduce this deficit. For the military, the impact equates to a reduction of force size and a decrease in the budget with which to equip the force.

The third element of change is the rapid emergence of advanced technologies. As the CNN images of precision-guided, long-range Tomahawk cruise missiles sailing across the morning skies of Baghdad portrayed - we can now see the battlefield with much greater resolution and immediately respond to what we see with accurate long-range missiles, rockets, and cannons.

2. A New Threat

In light of these changes, we find ourselves facing a much different threat than in the past, one much more diverse; one which requires a much different National Military Strategy. We now find ourselves living in a world whose politics and economics are being influenced primarily by emerging regional powers (e.g. Japan, Germany, and Korea). As the recent Iraqi invasion of Kuwait aptly demonstrated, these regional powers may pose a serious threat to our national interests. These potential

threats are global in nature and range from the Middle East and Northeast Asia to Latin America. Additionally, they represent a broad spectrum of operational challenges.

In the future, these potential threats may prove even more dangerous due to the proliferation of advanced weaponry, including weapons of mass destruction. In addition to these more obvious potential threats, problems of famine, violence, and natural disaster will most certainly lead to conflict within developing nations. The threat of drug traffickers and terrorists is ever present and, in these days of the shrinking defense dollar, those responsible for the appropriation of government funds have simultaneously called for the military to take a larger role in combatting these unconventional threats.

3. A New National Military Strategy

Our revised National Military Strategy must now largely focus on our flexibility and our ability to project varying levels of combat power to different parts of the world. Although we must still maintain some forward presence, it will be much reduced from previous levels.

In support of this strategic direction, the US Army must continue to provide well-trained, combat-ready forces capable of deploying into varying situations along the entire Operational Continuum of War, Conflict, and Peacetime Competition, on relatively short notice. War and Conflict are hostile states dominated by the use of force. Peacetime Competition is a non-hostile state in which we assist allies and promote democracy through providing military and economic assistance.[Ref. 1] Previously, our AirLand Battle doctrine focused on the Warsaw Pact threat in Central

Europe, a mechanized Middle East threat, and the threat posed by North Korea. In today's multi-polar political/military environment the Army's warfighting doctrine must clearly refocus on the much more diverse threat which we now face.

B. AIRLAND OPERATIONS: OUR NEW DOCTRINE

In light of these political, economic, and technological changes, the Army has developed a new strategy geared for the US Army of the 90s. This army will be a smaller army. However, it will be faced with global responsibilities ranging from fighting wars and regional conflicts, to conducting various peacetime operations in support of our allies in the realm of Low Intensity Conflict. The Army's revised warfighting strategy is known as the doctrine of "AirLand Operations." AirLand Operations refocuses the concepts and capabilities of AirLand Battle for an army trained and equipped to deploy anywhere in the world and handle a broad spectrum of missions once deployed.[Ref. 1] As the threat analysis indicates, we must be well trained in all three levels of operations (War, Conflict, and Peacetime Competition), equipped to deal with all three, and rapidly deployable to respond to any one (or more) which threatens our national security.

Of all the changes, technological advancements have had the greatest direct impact on the battlefield, where they have completely reshaped the conduct of our operations. In the past we have primarily operated on a structured "linear" battlefield with set unit boundaries and established terrain objectives. Every unit was tied in with its adjacent units. Revolutionary surveillance assets now allow us to accurately locate and monitor enemy forces on the battlefield, while new weapons technology gives us the potential to engage them with indirect fire at longer ranges and with increased

lethality and accuracy. As a result of these factors, operations conducted on the future battlefield will be extremely fast paced and much more lethal. With the downsized army, we will have fewer forces operating across larger areas which will result in sizeable gaps between units. Unit operations must be highly synchronized but much more independent resulting in a concept termed the "Nonlinear Battlefield."

Operations on the Nonlinear Battlefield will be characterized by frequent moves, with units remaining dispersed except when massing to fight the maneuver battle in order to maximize survivability. These operations will take place in four stages:

1. Detection - Preparation

During this stage, the commander determines how he wants to fight the enemy. He employs various electronic and human sensors and intelligence systems (ground, air, and space based) to locate, acquire, and target enemy units.

2. Establishing Conditions for Decisive Operations

During this stage, the commander uses long range Field Artillery fires and air assets against specific targets to weaken the enemy in preparation for the ground maneuver forces to move in and defeat the enemy.

3. Decisive Operations

This is the stage during which maneuver forces engage the enemy forces, both directly and with supporting close Field Artillery fires, in order to win the decisive battle.

4. Reconstitution

Following the decisive battle, maneuver forces disperse and reconstitute to perform sustainment operations.

C. FIRE SUPPORT IN AIRLAND OPERATIONS

One of the key principles of AirLand Operations is to destroy enemy forces at long range with precision fires. The goal is to take advantage of new acquisition technology which indicates where significant enemy forces are located on the battlefield. We are then able to minimize friendly casualties by avoiding a battle of grinding attrition. Instead, we engage the enemy with maneuver forces after he has been attrited to the point where we are able to quickly and decisively overwhelm him.

Clearly, under AirLand Operations the effective Fire Support of the US Army Field Artillery is absolutely crucial. It is the means by which enemy forces are conditioned prior to and during the decisive battle [Ref. 2].

Artillery fire support currently comprises both the Operational Fires of the Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS), and the Tactical Fires of both Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) rockets and cannon weapon systems. Operational fires are conducted in support of Corps level objectives and focus on longer range targets -these are referred to as Deep/Long Range Fires. Tactical fires are conducted in support of Division and Brigade level objectives and focus on shorter range targets - these are referred to as Close/Short Range Fires. The specific mission of each type of fire support is outlined below:

OPERATIONAL FIRES:

- Seize/retain initiative
- Destroy enemy forces/targets
- Isolate battlefield
- Desynchronize C2
- Set decisive conditions

TACTICAL FIRES:

- Destroy enemy forces
- Counterfire
- Isolate battlefield
- Close support fires
- Final destruction of threat

D. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. Background: Legal Mix VII Study

The US Army Field Artillery School's (USAFAS) Directorate of Combat Developments (DCD) is currently conducting a one year study titled "Legal Mix VII" to determine the optimal force mix, unit organization, and tactical employment of future fire support under the AirLand Operations concept. USAFAS is currently developing several new weapon systems and munitions in order to provide the long range fires necessary to support the force on the Nonlinear Battlefield. Among the issues Legal Mix VII is addressing is: " What is the most efficient, combat effective mix/combination and employment of these next generation weapon systems and munitions to support the Corps Deep Fires battle?"

2. The Next Generation Artillery Systems

a. Army Tactical Missile System Block I

The Army Tactical Missile System Block I (ATACMS I), is an improved conventional munition missile fired from the MLRS launcher. It can fire in excess of 100 km and is three times as accurate as its predecessor, the Lance missile. It was fielded early in order to be used in the Gulf War.

b. Army Tactical Missile System Block II

The Army Tactical Missile System Block II (ATACMS II), will be equipped with terminally guided submunitions in order to destroy moving enemy armor. The missile dispenses its submunitions once it is in the vicinity of the targets. The submunitions then glide towards the armored vehicles until they acquire a specific target to attack.

c. Paladin M109A6

The Paladin M109A6 is an improved version of the current M109 155-mm self-propelled howitzer. The Paladin, referred to in this study as the Howitzer Improvement Program (HIP), is equipped with an on-board navigation and computer system and will provide improved range, survivability, reliability, availability, and maintainability.

d. Sense and Destroy Armor Munitions

Sense and Destroy Armor munitions (SADARM), are being developed for both the HIP and the MLRS. SADARM is primarily a counterfire munition - used to destroy enemy artillery. The SADARM projectile releases submunitions over the target area which descend by parachute. The submunitions identify targets using millimeter wave or infrared sensor technology, and explosively fire penetrators onto the enemy elements.

e. Terminally Guided Projectile / Warhead

The Terminally Guided Projectile (TGP) and the Terminally Guided Warhead (TGW) are autonomous, terminal-homing, fire-and-forget munitions which use a millimeter wave seeker to acquire the target. The TGP is fired from the HIP, and the TGW is fired from the MLRS.[Ref. 3]

3. Scope and Purpose

This thesis focuses on the employment of these systems during the Deep Fires battle in support of US Corps operations in all possible Operational Scenarios in the year 2000 and beyond. The purpose of this study is to assist USAFAS in determining the optimal force mix and allocation of fires of these future Field Artillery

systems. Given the level of damage and effectiveness required by the Corps battlefield commander and the capabilities of our new developmental Artillery systems, as well as a projected threat assessment, a GAMS Linear Programming model was developed to assist in determining how many of these new systems (delivery system and munitions), to manufacture and how to best allocate them to targets on the future battlefield in order for the commander to meet his mission effectiveness requirements.

II. PROBLEM APPROACH

A. APPROACH TO FORCE COMPOSITION AND ALLOCATION OF FIRES

1. Optimizing Long Range Fires

Under AirLand Operations, our success clearly depends upon our accomplishing three things. First, we must effectively disrupt and destroy the enemy's Command, Control, and Communications (C3) elements. Second, we must destroy a significant portion of the enemy forces across several echelons (levels/belts of enemy formations), extending our attack well to the rear of his first echelon front-line forces. Without effective C3, and heavily attrited, the remaining enemy forces will be much less capable of mounting a coherent, coordinated attack or defense. Finally, our success depends upon our ability to deploy our maneuver forces to engage and destroy these remaining elements. If we can effectively accomplish the first two, we should be able to accomplish the third without suffering heavy losses.

This strategy therefore hinges on our ability to acquire and destroy enemy C3 assets and troop formations from extended ranges early in the battle. Advanced acquisition systems, such as the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), provide us with the location of these targets. We then depend upon our long range artillery systems, as well as air assets, to destroy them. For the purposes of this study we will only address the role of the long range artillery.

The new artillery systems being developed are technology intensive, and therefore much more expensive than previous systems. With a limited budget, we can only afford a limited inventory. They also take longer to manufacture than the

cannons and high explosive rounds of past conflicts. Yet we expect future conflict to be fast paced, highly lethal, and short in duration. Hence, we must plan to fight a "come as you are" war. We will not have time to gear up production in order to build up the inventories of the most needed systems. We must take a look now at the systems we are currently developing, in order to project which systems to build over the next decade and how many of them we will need in our inventory by the year 2000.

Our most tightly constrained resource is the money we need to build this future artillery inventory. Therefore, the specific objective of the study is to provide USAFAS with a tool to determine the most cost effective weapons and munitions mix with which to equip our army in the future, in order to defeat the enemy force. For the purpose of this study, defeating the enemy is specifically defined as meeting the Commander's Kill Criteria. The Measure of Effectiveness applied to the Kill Criteria is the overall percent of each type of enemy system killed over the entire battle.

Once deployed, these weapons and munitions will be arrayed against diverse types of enemy systems located all across and at all depths of the battlefield. Therefore, in order to determine the optimal force mix, we must determine the optimal weapons and munitions to use to attack each type of system in order to defeat the enemy we expect to face in the beginning of the next century.

To assist the Artillery School solve this problem, I developed the **Artillery Attack Model** Linear Programming model formulation and GAMS program [Ref. 4]. Of course, the results of the model depend upon the specific Operational Scenario which is used in the model. With the rapidly changing political environment, there are many possible enemy forces we could face in a variety of locations and climates. The

model is designed to be a personal computer portable tool, flexible enough for the artillery force development planner to use to determine the optimal weapons and munitions mix for any of the possible scenarios . Although the model is primarily intended to answer the mix (composition), and allocation question for the artillery systems currently being developed, it is also flexible enough to incorporate the existing weapon and munition inventories of the current systems. Once the composition of the necessary systems is determined, they can be budgeted, procured, pre-positioned, and manned. Then when we " come as we are " onto the next battlefield, we will truly come with what we need to meet our crucial missions under AirLand Operations.

2. The Deterministic Aggregated Combat Model Approach

In the Artillery Attack model, all combat processes are treated deterministically. In addition, weapon, munition and target entities are aggregated together rather than treated individually. This provides the flexibility necessary to model large artillery elements and their opposing enemy forces without developing a large, expensive, high resolution model. Aggregation also keeps the model within the limits of reasonable execution time on a micro-computer. Long range fires are therefore modeled using average rather than individual engagements. Using Heterogeneous Aggregation, weapons, munitions, and targets are each tracked by total number of each sub-type.[Ref. 5] Specific aspects of this aggregation approach to the combat modeling portion of the study include:

a. Operational Scenario

The entire study is driven by the Operational Scenario we expect to face in the future. The key element of the Operational Scenario is the nature of the enemy force:

1. Who is the enemy?
2. With what systems is the enemy equipped?
3. Where are enemy elements located on the battlefield?
4. When are the enemy elements deployed there?
5. How does the enemy fight (fire and maneuver)?

Other elements of the scenario include: the geographical location and characteristics, as well as the civil/political situation. In the model, the enemy weapon systems are categorized as "Targets," and all the information inherent to the Operational Scenario is aggregated into the Target Data input by the user of the model. The user defines the different types of Targets, and inputs them by quantity, location, and battle time phase. He defines how they fight by entering general mobility and lethality data. Through this methodology, the model can be applied to any of the possible Operational Scenarios being postulated.

b. Battlefield Representation

The battlefield is represented by a series of Range Bands. The depth of the Range Bands, which is defined by the user, determines both the weapons/munitions that are capable of ranging the target and the distance advanced by the attacking forces during each phase of the battle. This allows the user to

represent a specific operational scenario with enemy forces properly templated across and to the full depth of the battlefield.

c. Time Advance Mechanism

The model uses a Fixed Time Step to incorporate the passage of time. This allows the user to depict the variable movement of attacking forces on the battlefield. The time step is called a "Phase" and its length is set by the user.

d. Movement

The movement of offensive forces is modeled by assigning a movement rate to each type of enemy element. All elements of a specific type advance the same number of Range Bands per Phase, depending upon the rate input by the user. To depict enemy offensive scenarios, each enemy element is assigned a unique movement rate which most accurately depicts its degree of mobility. Some elements, such as logistics bases, may be set to remain stationary; while others, such as tank companies, may be set to advance several Range Bands. To depict long range fires in enemy defensive scenarios, all enemy elements are assigned a movement rate of zero to reflect the relatively static nature of Stage two of AirLand Operations.

e. Command and Control

The only command and control decision element represented by the model is the Commander's Kill Criteria, which is the minimum percent of each enemy system which must be destroyed during each phase of the long range fires battle.

f. Intelligence and Target Acquisition

The model reflects the advanced acquisition technology which AirLand Operations is predicated upon. The enemy elements input by the user are the focus

of all Corps target acquisition efforts. Hence, they are assumed to be accurately located given our advanced acquisition capabilities and susceptible to attack by any weapon/munition in range.

g. Engagement and Attrition

(1) *Linearity of Massed Fires.* Both the engagement of enemy forces and the attrition of friendly weapons are treated as linear processes. The key to maximizing the effects of indirect artillery fire against the enemy is achieving surprise. By putting as much "steel on target" as possible all at once, we catch the enemy when he is most vulnerable and can achieve devastating results. In order to achieve these effects, the artillery employs a technique termed "Massing Fires." Massing Fires is attacking a target with fires from several different units simultaneously. It is coordinated so all of the rounds impact on the enemy at the exact same time. Each round can be expected to have the same effect. The effects of Massed Fires are therefore linear in nature, with the total effects of an attack linearly dependent upon the type and quantity of munitions used. This is normally the technique employed by corps units providing Long Range Fires in support of the Preparation and Establishing phases of AirLand Operations.

The alternate technique is termed "Volley Fire," and is normally employed when fewer units are available to attack a target. Attacking by Volley Fire is firing several times in succession at the same target. It normally requires fewer firing units, but is less effective because it gives the enemy the opportunity to take protective cover from the shrapnel or move out of the targeted location.

By employing Massed Fires, we achieve much greater effectiveness. By modeling Massed Fires, we are able to model the effects of the long range artillery linearly and avoid the case of the non-linear effects of Volley Fire which is more characteristically employed by artillery units supporting maneuver units with short range, Close-Supporting Fires during the Decisive Operations phase of AirLand Operations.

(2) *Linearity of Aggregated Engagements.* In addition to modeling the natural linearity of Massed Fires, the aggregated approach employed in this model also focuses upon the overall linear effects of artillery upon the entire enemy force. The Artillery Attack Model aggregates all engagements by target type, rather than treating each engagement individually. While it is not reasonable to expect twice the missions fired at a given target to have twice the effect, it is reasonable to expect separate attacks on two individual targets to have twice the effect of either conducted alone [Ref. 4:p.11]. The model considers engagements as a series of individual attacks against individual targets, and treats them in the aggregate.

(3) *Effects Construct.* The model uses an Effects construct which combines the Probability of hitting a target and the Probability of killing a target given that it is hit. Each type of munition is fired from a specific associated weapon and is able to destroy a specified fraction of each type of enemy system. This construct fits the aggregated structure of the model and the test data being generated by USAFAS in its testing of the developmental weapon systems.

(4) *Attrition.* A weapon can be used to attack any enemy system whose range is less than the weapon's Max Range. As weapons fire, they receive counterfire from the enemy and are attrited based upon the number of missions they fire and a Loss Rate associated with the munition and the range of the targets. The more missions a weapon fires, the more likely that it is detected by enemy target acquisition radar and the more losses it sustains. The closer the weapon is to the targets, the higher the Loss Rate.

h. Logistics

The overall focus of the study is to determine how many of each weapon system and type of munition to produce and stock in the inventory. This is dependent upon the number of enemy forces on the battlefield and how many of them must be destroyed. This in turn drives the number of munitions expended which determines the number of weapons required, based upon the Rate of Fire for each weapon.

Each weapon and munition has an associated Production Cost and Operating and Support Costs (O&S). Weapon Operating and Support Costs are a function of both time (number of Phases) deployed on the battlefield and amount of use (number of missions fired). Munition Operating and Support Costs are only a function of time since munitions can only be "used" once, and the cost of their use is captured by their Production Cost.

i. Approach Summary

While not representing the aspects of combat processes with the detail of a high resolution model, this approach incorporates the major elements of the Long

Range Fires Battle in a straightforward, highly flexible model construct which can be readily applied by USAFAS to the future force mix problem.

B. ASSUMPTIONS AND SIMPLIFICATIONS

1. The Operational Scenario can be accurately represented by the structure of the user input Target Array and target movement construct.
2. Target priority values are implicitly assigned by the Commander's Kill Criteria for each type of Target.
3. Meeting the Commander's Kill Criteria for all types of Targets equates to mission accomplishment for Long Range Fires, without regard for what specific targets are killed.
4. Friendly units have perfect acquisition of all enemy systems in the Corps area of the battlefield.
5. There is no difference between day and night Long Range Fires.
6. All fire missions are Fire for Effect without adjusting onto the Target.
7. All Targets are attacked with Massed Fires, not a series of volleys.
8. Targets do not assume different protective postures during the battle.
9. Friendly attrition due to enemy counterfire is a function of the number of missions fired and the range to the Targets.
10. There are no resupply constraints incorporated into the model. The model allows the resupply of all the weapons and munitions required to accomplish the mission.
11. The attacking weapon systems move an integer number of Range Bands per Phase.
12. The model aggregates weapons, munitions, and targets, and uses average engagement rates to represent the total results of individual engagements.
13. Systems are not sub-grouped together into individual tactical units.
14. The model employs a low resolution approach to combat modeling.

C. DATA

1. Source

The model was developed for the Directorate of Combat Developments (DCD), US Army Field Artillery School, Fort Sill, Oklahoma. DCD is responsible for the development and evaluation of the new long range artillery systems. Many of these systems are currently being tested. Their performance data is classified and their cost data is unknown. For the systems still under development, both elements of data are unknown.

In order to validate the model, we used a notional set of Test Case Data in order to keep the process unclassified. The results are presented in Chapter IV. The actual classified data will only be used by DCD at FT Sill.

2. Elements

a. Friendly Force

- (1) Types of Weapons and Munitions Available.*
- (2) Production and Operating and Support Costs.*
- (3) Number of Battle Phases Being Modeled.*
- (4) Number of Range Bands Being Modeled.*
- (5) Commander's Kill Criteria.*
- (6) Weapons / Munitions Effects (Lethality).*
- (7) Weapons / Munitions Max Range.*
- (8) Weapons / Munitions Operational Mode Maximum Rate of Fire.*

b. *Enemy Force*

- (1) *Types of Enemy Systems (Targets).*
- (2) *Initial Array of Targets (Start of Phase 1):*
 - Number
 - Location (Range Band)
 - Mobility Index
- (3) *New Targets Deploying After Phase 1.*
- (4) *Enemy Counterfire Effectiveness.*

III. ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL LP FORMULATION

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the mathematical formulation of the Artillery Attack Model. The model is a Minimum Cost Linear Programming formulation. The formulation is presented in the Naval Postgraduate School Format.

B. INDICES

1. Type of Weapon System - *w*

a. HIP

Paladin Improved Howitzer.

b. MLRS

Multiple Launch Rocket System.

2. Type of Munition - *m*

a. For HIP

(1) *DPICMH*. Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munitions.

(2) *HE*. High Explosive Projectile.

(3) *SADARMH*. Sense and Destroy Armor.

(4) *TGP*. Terminally Guided Projectile.

b. *For MLRS*

- (1) *ATACMSI*. Army Tactical Missile System Block I.
- (2) *ATACMSII*. Army Tactical Missile System Block II.
- (3) *DPICMM*. Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munitions.
- (4) *SADARMM*. Sense and Destroy Armor.
- (5) *TGW*. Terminally Guided Warhead.

3. Type of Target (Enemy System) - t

a. *ARTY*

Field Artillery Battery.

b. *C3*

Command, Control, Communications Element.

c. *MRC*

Motorized Rifle Company.

d. *TANK*

Tank Company.

4. Battle Time Phase - p

a. *1*

Phase 1 - 1st hour of battle.

b. *2*

Phase 2 - 2nd hour of battle.

c. 3

Phase 3 - 3rd hour of battle.

5. Target Range Band - r

a. 1

Target located 00 - 30 KM away.

b. 2

Target located 30 - 60 KM away.

c. 3

Target located 60 - 90 KM away.

d. 4

Target located 90 - 120 KM away.

C. DATA

1. DISTANCE_t

Number of Range Bands Target t advances per Phase.

2. EFFECTS_{w,m,t}

Weapon w / Munition m effects against Target type t (Number of Tgts destroyed per round of munition).

3. FIRERATE_{w,m}

Weapon w / Munition m max Operational Mode long-term sustained rate of fire (Rounds of munition per Phase).

4. KILPERCENT_{t,r}

Commander's Kill Criteria for Target t at Range r (% Target t Range r killed each Phase).

5. LOSSRATE_{w,m,r}

Loss Rate of Weapon w firing Munition m at targets at Range r due to counterfire (# Weapons attrited per round of munition m fired).

6. MAXRANGE_{w,m}

Max range for Weapon w / Munition m (Range Band number).

7. MOCOST_m

Munition m O&S Cost per Phase on battlefield (Thousands of dollars).

8. MPCOST_m

Munition m Production Cost (Thousands of dollars).

9. NEWTGTS_{t,p,r}

Number of new Targets of type t deployed onto battlefield at Range r during Phase p .

10. WOCOSTM_w

Weapon w O&S Cost per round of munition fired (Thousands of dollars).

11. WOCOSTP_w

Weapon w O&S Cost per Phase on battlefield (Thousands of dollars).

12. WPCOST_w

Weapon w Production Cost (Thousands of dollars).

D. VARIABLES

1. **EXCESSM_{m,p}**

Number of Munition m remaining at end of Phase p.

2. **EXCESSW_{w,p}**

Number of Weapon w remaining at end of Phase p.

3. **MPROD_{m,p}**

Number of Munitions m required to Produce and Resupply for Phase p.

4. **TGTS_{t,p,r}**

Total Targets t during Phase p at Range r (Before losses).

5. **TOTCOST**

Total Cost of Weapons and Munitions (Over entire battle).

6. **WPROD_{w,p}**

Number of Weapons w required to Produce and Resupply for Phase p.

7. **X_{w,m,t,p,r}**

Number Missions (Rounds) fired by all Weapons w with Munition m against Target t at Range r during Phase p.

E. MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

MINIMIZE TOTAL COST =

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\sum_W \sum_P (WPROD_{w,p} * WPCOST_w) \right] + \\
& \sum_N \left[\sum_{p=1}^k WOCOSTP_w * \left(\sum_{i=1}^P WPROD_{w,i} - \sum_{i=1}^{P-1} \left(\sum_M \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} * LOSSRATE_{w,m,r} \right) \right) \right] + \\
& \sum_N \left[\sum_M \sum_T \sum_P \sum_R (X_{w,m,t,p,r} * WOCOSTM_w) \right] + \\
& \left[\sum_M \sum_P (MPROD_{m,p} * MPCOST_m) \right] + \\
& \sum_M \left[\sum_{p=1}^k MOCOST_m * \left(\sum_{i=1}^P MPROD_{m,i} - \sum_{i=1}^{P-1} \left(\sum_N \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} \right) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

SUBJECT TO :

$$\begin{aligned}
1. \quad TGTS_{t,p,r} &= [TGTS_{t,p-1,x+DISTANCE(t)}] - \\
& \left[\sum_W \sum_M (X_{w,m,t,p-1,x+DISTANCE(t)} * EFFECTS_{w,m,t}) \right] + NEWTGTS_{t,p,r} \quad , \quad \forall (t,p,r)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
2. \quad & \left[\sum_W \sum_M (X_{w,m,t,p,r} * EFFECTS_{w,m,t}) \right] \geq [TGTS_{t,p,r} * \\
& KILPERCENT_{t,r}] \quad , \quad \forall (t,p,r)
\end{aligned}$$

$$3. \left[\sum_N \sum_M (X_{w,m,t,p,r} * EFFECTS_{w,m,t}) \right] \leq TGTS_{t,p,r} , \quad \forall (t,p,r)$$

$$4. \quad WPROD_{w,p} \geq \left[\sum_M \left(\sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,p,r} / FIRERATE_{w,m} \right) \right] + \left[\sum_M \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,p,r} * LOSSRATE_{w,m,r} \right] - EXCESSW_{w,p-1} , \quad \forall (w,p)$$

$$5. \quad MPROD_{m,p} \geq \left[\sum_N \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,p,r} \right] - EXCESSM_{m,p-1} , \quad \forall (m,p)$$

$$6. \quad EXCESSW_{w,p} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^P WPROD_{w,i} \right] - \left[\sum_{i=1}^P \left(\sum_M \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} * LOSSRATE_{w,m,r} \right) \right] , \quad \forall (w,p)$$

$$7. \quad EXCESSM_{m,p} =$$

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^P MPROD_{m,i} \right] - \left[\sum_{i=1}^P \left(\sum_N \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} \right) \right] , \quad \forall (m,p)$$

1. Objective Function

MINIMIZE :

$$\text{TOTAL COST} = \text{WEAPONS COST} + \text{MUNITIONS COST}$$

- Production cost

- Production Cost

- Operating & Support

- Operating & Support

$$\text{TOTAL COST} =$$

a. WEAPONS PRODUCTION COST:

$$\left[\sum_W \sum_P (WPROD_{w,p} * WPCOST_w) \right] +$$

b. WEAPONS O/S COST (TIME/PHASE COST):

$$\sum_W \left[\sum_{p=1}^k WOCOSTP_w * \left(\sum_{i=1}^p WPROD_{w,i} - \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \left(\sum_M \sum_T \sum_R (X_{w,m,t,i,r} * LOSSRATE_{w,m,r}) \right) \right) \right] +$$

c. WEAPONS O/S COST (MISSION COST):

$$\sum_W \left[\sum_M \sum_T \sum_P \sum_R (X_{w,m,t,p,r} * WOCOSTM_w) \right] +$$

d. MUNITIONS PRODUCTION COST:

$$\left[\sum_M \sum_P (MPROD_{m,p} * MPCOST_m) \right] +$$

e. MUNITIONS O/S COST (TIME/PHASE COST):

$$\sum_M \left[\sum_{p=1}^k MOCOST_m * \left(\sum_{i=1}^p MPROD_{m,i} - \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \left(\sum_W \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} \right) \right) \right]$$

a. Weapons Production Cost

The Weapons Production Cost is the sum of the total production costs for each type of weapon system.

b. Weapons Operating and Support Cost - for Time Phases

The Weapons O&S Cost for Time Phases captures the O&S costs (personnel, maintenance, fuel) associated with operating a weapon system for a phase of the battle independent of the number of missions it fires. It is determined by:

$(\text{Weapon Inventory})_{w,p} * (\text{O\&S Cost per Phase})_w$ for each weapon and each phase.

Weapon Inventory_{w,p} is the total weapons produced minus the number lost up to that phase of battle. The number of weapons systems lost in a phase is a function of the missions fired by that type of system and an associated loss-rate.

c. Weapons Operating and Support Cost - for Missions Fired

The Weapons O&S Cost for Missions Fired captures the O&S costs associated with firing a weapon system. It is determined by:

$(\text{Total Missions Fired by Weapon System})_w * (\text{O\&S Cost per Mission})_w$ for each weapon system over the entire battle.

d. Munitions Costs

Munitions costs are determined in the same manner except there is no O&S Cost for missions fired since munitions are used only once and this is captured by the Munition Production Cost. The munitions inventory is the number produced minus the number fired.

2. Constraints

SUBJECT TO :

a. Determine Number Targets - For Each (t,p,r)

$$TGTS_{t,p,r} = [TGTS_{t,p-1,r+DISTANCE(t)}] - \left[\sum_W \sum_M (X_{w,m,t,p-1,r+DISTANCE(t)} * EFFECTS_{w,m,t}) \right] + NEWTGTS_{t,p,r}$$

The model determines the number of each type of target deployed within each range band of the battlefield for each phase of the battle. The number of $TGTS_{t,p,r}$ is the number of enemy elements of type t which survived the previous phase of battle and advanced forward into range band r, plus any $NEWTGTS_{t,p,r}$ which deploy onto range band r of the battlefield during phase p. This is the inventory of targets present prior to target kills being assessed. The number of targets advancing into a range band is dependent upon the $DISTANCE_t$ parameter assigned to each type of target. The number of targets killed is a function of the munitions fired at that type of target and the $EFFECTS_{T,P,R}$ parameter assigned to each type of munition. In addition to defining the initial array of enemy forces and follow-on echelons, the parameter $NEWTGTS_{t,p,r}$ has the flexibility to be used to introduce airborne and special forces elements anywhere onto the battlefield.

b. Meet Commander's Kill Criteria - For Each (t,p,r)

$$\left[\sum_W \sum_M (X_{w,m,t,p,r} * EFFECTS_{w,m,t}) \right] \geq [TGTS_{t,p,r} * KILPERCENT_{t,r}]$$

The model optimally determines which targets to attack with the types of weapons and munitions available. It fires the number of missions necessary to kill the required percentage of each type of target specified by the maneuver commander. The model determines where and when to attack targets based upon weapon ranges and effects, as well as counterfire loss-rates, in order to minimize the cost of achieving the commander's kill criteria.

c. Limit Engagements to Existing Targets - For Each (t,p,r)

$$\left[\sum_W \sum_M (X_{w,m,t,p,r} * EFFECTS_{w,m,t}) \right] \leq TGTS_{t,p,r}$$

The long-range artillery fires cannot kill more targets in a range band, than the enemy has deployed within that range band of the battlefield.

d. Determine Weapon Production/Resupply Requirements - For Each (w,p)

$$WPROD_{w,p} \geq \left[\sum_M \left(\sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,p,r} / FIRERATE_{w,m} \right) \right] + \left[\sum_M \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,p,r} * LOSSRATE_{w,m,r} \right] - EXCESSW_{w,p-1}$$

The model determines the number of each type of weapon system required each phase to deliver the munitions necessary to kill the enemy and to cover the losses to enemy counterfire. It then subtracts the number of weapons remaining from the previous phase to determine the $WPROD_{w,p}$. The number required is a function of the number of missions to be fired and the weapon's operational mode

maximum rate of fire. Counterfire losses are a function of the number of missions fired and the $LOSSRATE_{w,m,r}$ associated with firing the munition at targets at range r .

e. Determine Munition Production/Resupply Requirements - For Each (m,p)

$$MPROD_{m,p} \geq \left[\sum_W \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,p,r} \right] - EXCESSM_{m,p-1}$$

The model determines the number of each type of munition required each phase to kill the enemy. It then subtracts the number remaining from the previous phase to determine the $MPROD_{m,p}$.

f. Determine Number Weapons Remaining End of Each Phase - For Each (w,p)

$$EXCESSW_{w,p} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^P WPROD_{w,i} \right] - \left[\sum_{i=1}^P \left(\sum_M \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} * LOSSRATE_{w,m,r} \right) \right]$$

The model determines the number of weapons of each type which remain at the end of each phase by subtracting the total number of weapons lost from the total number produced, through that phase of battle.

g. Determine Number Munitions Remaining End of Each Phase - For Each (m,p)

$$EXCESSM_{m,p} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^P MPROD_{m,i} \right] - \left[\sum_{i=1}^P \left(\sum_W \sum_T \sum_R X_{w,m,t,i,r} \right) \right]$$

The model determines the number of munitions of each type which remain at the end of each phase by subtracting the total number of munitions fired from the total produced, through that phase of battle.



IV. APPLICATION OF THE ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL

A. TEST CASE OPERATIONAL SCENARIO

The purpose of this chapter is to apply the model to a Test Data Case and examine the results. The Test Case presents an Operational Scenario in which a US Corps is defending against a Soviet Combined Arms Army (CAA), attacking in Central Europe. In light of current political changes in the Soviet Union, this appears to be an unlikely scenario. However, it presents a good example of how the model works within the context of a threat scenario with which all military analysts are familiar. The CAA is configured with three Motorized Rifle Divisions and one Tank Division. The model only depicts maneuver elements, artillery units, and tactical operations centers (C3 elements) for regiments and above. The enemy force is arrayed in March Formation in preparation for offensive operations. The enemy Order of Battle is depicted below in Figure 1.



120 KM

Army Second Echelon Division






90 KM

Army First Echelon Divisions







60 KM

Division Hqs / Second Echelon Regiments



30 KM

Division First Echelon Regiments



0 KM

Army / Division Forward Elements

Figure 1 Test Case Combined Arms Army Order of Battle

B. TEST CASE INPUT DATA SET

1. Enemy Forces

The number and location of the initial enemy forces are based upon the Order of Battle presented in Figure 1, and represented in the model by the following initial target array values for Parameter $NEWTGTS_{t,p=1,r}$:

ENEMY FORCES DEPLOYED START OF PHASE 1 :				
TARGET TYPE :	RANGE 1	RANGE 2	RANGE 3	RANGE 4
ARTILLERY BATTERIES	9	66	9	24
MOTORIZED RIFLE COMPANIES	9	72	9	12
TACTICAL OPNS CTRS	0	9	6	6
TANK COMPANIES	27	0	27	30

For the Test Case, there are no new targets appearing after Phase 1. Therefore Parameter $NEWTGTS_{t,p=2,r}$ and $NEWTGTS_{t,p=3,r}$ matrices are both equal to zero.

2. Movement of Enemy Forces

The movement of the offensive forces is represented by the following values for the Parameter $DISTANCE_t$. Tactical Operations Centers are assigned a movement parameter equal to zero in order to demonstrate the implementation of stationary targets.

ENEMY FORCE RATE OF MOVEMENT :		
TARGET TYPE :	ACTUAL DISTANCE:	PARAMETER DISTANCE _T :
ARTILLERY BATTERIES	30 KM	1
MOTORIZED RIFLE COMPANIES	30 KM	1
TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	0 KM	0
TANK COMPANIES	30 KM	1

3. Commander's Kill Criteria

The percent of each target which the maneuver commander requires to be killed is outlined in the following values for $KILPERCENT_{t,r}$:

PERCENTAGE OF ENEMY FORCES REQUIRED TO BE KILLED :				
TARGET TYPE :	RANGE 1	RANGE 2	RANGE 3	RANGE 4
ARTILLERY BATTERIES	.8	.8	.5	.5
MOTORIZED RIFLE COMPANIES	.8	.4	.1	.1
TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	.6	.8	.8	.8
TANK COMPANIES	.9	.6	.3	.1

4. Artillery Effectiveness

The lethality of each weapon/munition combination against each type of enemy element is outlined in the following table of values for the Parameter $EFFECTS_{w,m,t}$:

EFFECTS OF INDIVIDUAL ROUND OF MUNITION AGAINST TARGETS					
WEAPON SYSTEM :	MUNITION TYPE :	TARGET TYPE :			
		ARTY	MRC	TOC	TANK
HIP	DPICM	.03	.08	.08	.05
HIP	HE	.00	.07	.07	.03
HIP	SADARM	.07	.12	.12	.07
HIP	TGP	.08	.12	.12	.03
MLRS	ATACMS I	.80	1.0	1.0	1.0
MLRS	ATACMS II	.80	1.0	1.0	1.0
MLRS	DPICM	.12	.15	.13	.10
MLRS	SADARM	.13	.16	.15	.12
MLRS	TGW	.90	1.0	.90	.80

5. Artillery Rate of Fire

The Operational Mode maximum rate of fire for each weapon/munition combination input for Parameter $FIRERATE_{w,m}$ is :

MAX RATE OF FIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL WEAPON/MUNITION :					
WEAPON	MUNITION				
HIP	DPICM	HE	SADARM	TGP	
	3	3	3	3	
MLRS	ATACMSI	ATACMSII	DPICM	SADARM	TGW
	6	6	18	18	6

6. Artillery Maximum Range

The maximum range of each weapon/munition is outlined below in the table values for Parameter $MAXRANGE_{w,m}$:

MAXIMUM RANGE OF WEAPON/MUNITION :					
WEAPON	MUNITION				
HIP	DPICM	HE	SADARM	TGP	
	1	1	1	1	
MLRS	ATACMSI	ATACMSII	DPICM	SADARM	TGW
	4	4	2	2	2

7. Counterfire Rate of Enemy Artillery

As our artillery fires, the enemy target acquisition radar attempts to locate our units and send counter-battery fire to destroy our artillery elements. The resulting friendly attrition is a function of the values input for Parameter $LOSSRATE_{w,m,r}$:

COUNTERFIRE LOSS RATE PER INDIVIDUAL ROUND FIRED :					
WEAPON SYSTEM :	MUNITION TYPE :	RANGE 1	RANGE 2	RANGE 3	RANGE 4
HIP	DPICM	.00	.00	.00	.00
HIP	HE	.01	.10	.00	.00
HIP	SADARM	.00	.00	.00	.00
HIP	TGP	.04	.10	.00	.00
MLRS	ATACMS I	.10	.05	.01	.01
MLRS	ATACMS II	.10	.05	.00	.01
MLRS	DPICM	.02	.01	.00	.00
MLRS	SADARM	.02	.01	.00	.00
MLRS	TGW	.01	.05	.00	.00

8. Weapon Costs

WEAPON COSTS (Thousands of Dollars) :			
WEAPON SYSTEM	PRODUCTION COST	O / S COST (PHASE)	O / S COST (MISSIONS)
HIP	200	10	1
MLRS	2000	100	10

9. Munition Costs

MUNITION COSTS (Thousands of Dollars) :		
MUNITION	PRODUCTION COST	O / S COST (PHASE)
ATACMS I	200.0	0.5
ATACMS II	400.0	0.5
DPICM (HIP)	0.8	0.4
DPICM (MLRS)	5.0	0.4
HE	0.3	0.1
SADARM (HIP)	10.0	0.2
SADARM (MLRS)	20.0	0.4
TGP	10.0	0.2
TGW	100.0	0.4

C. MODEL SOLUTION PROCEDURE

1. Applying the General Algebraic Modeling System

In order to utilize the computer to solve the Artillery Attack Model, the Linear Programming model formulation was coded in the General Algebraic Modeling System (GAMS) programming language. GAMS is a high level language used to formulate mathematical models with algebraic statements which can be easily modified and easily transported from one computer environment to another [Ref. 6]. It is an ideal tool to meet the flexibility and exportability requirements of USAFAS. The Artillery Attack Model GAMS computer formulation is presented in Appendix A.

2. Applying the Zero/One Optimization Method XMP Solver

Once the model was encoded in the GAMS programming language, it was solved utilizing the solution algorithm of the Zero/One Optimization Method (ZOOM) Solver. ZOOM is a Fortran based system used to solve Mixed Integer Programming problems. GAMS/ZOOM first solves the problem as a Linear Program using the XMP Linear Programming library. It then uses the Pivot and Complement heuristic, as well as, the Branch and Bound search procedure to find an integer solution.[Ref. 6:p. 225]

D. TEST CASE OUTPUT / RESULTS

Solving the model using GAMS/ZOOM generated the GAMS Listing file "AAM LISTING" which is presented in Appendix B. Although AAM GAMS is coded as a Mixed Integer Problem (MIP), solving for the integer solution takes an inordinate amount of central processor time (CPU). Solving the problem as a Relaxed Mixed Integer Problem (RMIP), not only takes a fraction of the CPU time, but also yields a very good real number approximation.

The Test Case problem was first solved using RMIP and then modified to display an integer equivalent solution using the GAMS CEIL function which rounds up to the next higher integer. This yields the most "conservative" approximation of the missions, weapons, and munitions required for the given scenario. The total cost for both the real and integer set of missions, weapons, and munitions are displayed at the bottom of the Listing File. The specific results are outlined below.

1. Part I - Optimal Weapon / Munition Mix

a. Weapons Required

NUMBER OF WEAPONS REQUIRED :				
WEAPON SYSTEM :	PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3	TOTAL
HIP	23	0	0	23
MLRS	38	0	0	38

b. Munitions Required

NUMBER OF MUNITIONS REQUIRED :				
MUNITION TYPE :	PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3	TOTAL
ATACMS I	68	19	1	88
ATACMS II	0	0	0	0
DPICM (HIP)	0	54	48	102
DPICM (MLRS)	0	231	33	264
HE	0	0	0	0
SADARM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
SADARM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
TGP	60	0	0	60
TGW	106	36	29	171

2. Part II - Optimal Target Allocation

a. Target Type - Artillery Batteries

MUNITIONS USED TO ATTACK - ARTILLERY BATTERIES :				
MUNITION TYPE :	PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3	TOTAL
ATACMS I	21	8	0	29
ATACMS II	0	0	0	0
DPICM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
DPICM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
HE	0	0	0	0
SADARM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
SADARM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
TGP	0	0	0	0
TGW	67	16	7	90

b. Target Type - Motorized Rifle Companies

MUNITIONS USED TO ATTACK - MOTOR. RIFLE COMPANIES :				
MUNITION TYPE :	PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3	TOTAL
ATACMS I	3	2	0	5
ATACMS II	0	0	0	0
DPICM (HIP)	0	54	48	102
DPICM (MLRS)	0	222	31	253
HE	0	0	0	0
SADARM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
SADARM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
TGP	60	0	0	60
TGW	32	6	0	38

c. *Target Type - Tactical Operations Centers*

MUNITIONS USED TO ATTACK - TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS :				
MUNITION TYPE :	PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3	TOTAL
ATACMS I	10	2	2	14
ATACMS II	0	0	0	0
DPICM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
DPICM (MLRS)	0	10	2	12
HE	0	0	0	0
SADARM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
SADARM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
TGP	0	0	0	0
TGW	8	0	0	8

d. Target Type - Tank Companies

MUNITIONS USED TO ATTACK - TANK COMPANIES :				
MUNITION TYPE :	PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3	TOTAL
ATACMS I	37	9	0	46
ATACMS II	0	0	0	0
DPICM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
DPICM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
HE	0	0	0	0
SADARM (HIP)	0	0	0	0
SADARM (MLRS)	0	0	0	0
TGP	0	0	0	0
TGW	0	15	24	39

3. Part III - Optimal Total Cost

TOTAL COST (Dollars) :
\$ 132,586,600

4. Analysis of Model Results

It is interesting to note that the Test Case results indicate that all weapon systems required over the entire three phase battle should be supplied during the initial phase of battle. This makes intuitive sense in view of the fact that there are 45 enemy company sized units already within 30 km at the start of Phase one, and the closer the enemy units are, the higher the percentage that must be killed. Therefore the model expends in Phase 1, over a third of the total munitions required for the entire battle. Given the maximum operational mode weapon rates of fire and the resulting attrition, the weapons required for Phase 1 are sufficient to meet all fire mission requirements for Phase 2 and Phase 3 as well.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A. SUMMARY

The Artillery Attack Model provides the Artillery School with a Mixed Integer Linear Programming formulation to assist in determining the optimal (least expensive) weapon/munition force mix and tactical employment of the next generation artillery systems. The model is coded in the GAMS programming language used at USAFAS and employs the standard GAMS/ZOOM solver. The model can be easily modified by the user to incorporate changing tactics or technologies. It provides the flexibility to model the myriad of operational scenarios possible in today's changing political environment. It can also integrate any future weapon/munition technology with supporting or projected performance and support data, as well as, accommodate existing inventories of current weapon systems. The Artillery Attack Model will help ensure that the US Field Artillery is prepared to provide the long range fires so crucial to our success under AirLand Operations - the same consistently accurate and deadly fires which long ago earned it the title "the King of Battle."

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Suggested Improvements

a. Reconstitution

Presently, the model does not incorporate the reconstitution capability of units - the repair and return to service of damaged weapon systems. This can be done by designating a certain percentage of enemy targets killed and friendly attrition

losses as damaged rather than destroyed. Currently all target kills and attrition losses are considered catastrophic kills.

b. Expanded Target Types

The model could be expanded to represent more enemy Combat Support and Combat Service Support elements such as Air Defense, Engineer, Signal, and Logistics units.

c. Day / Night Distinction

If test data suggests degraded target acquisition and engagement at night, then the model could be modified to incorporate a day phase/night phase rotation sequence with separate day and night NUMTGTS_{t,p,r} and EFFECTS_{w,m,t} data.

d. PHIT/PKILL Construct

The model employs a low-resolution approach to modeling the effects of engaging enemy forces, using a fractional kill per round of munition fired. If data were available to determine the probability of hit given accurate target location and the subsequent probability of kill given the target is hit, engagement could be modeled perhaps more precisely using a Bayesian probability methodology.

e. Incorporate the Non-Linearity of Changing Protective Posture

Although long range fires are normally massed and the model deals with targets in the aggregate, the Commander's Kill Criteria may dictate that a certain portion of enemy elements are attacked more than once in a phase. This would result in reduced effects as they move either under cover or to an alternate position. In order to capture this possible aspect of battle, the long range fires process could either be

modeled non-linearly or an effectiveness factor could be applied to the $EFFECTS_{w,m,t}$ Parameter based upon the percentage of a given target type engaged during a given phase.

2. Follow - On Study

The next logical question to be answered is: "Once we have the weapons and munitions we need, where do we put them?" This is a three step problem:

a. Input

The determining inputs to the problem are the costs and the scenarios. First we must determine or estimate the costs to pre-position the weapons and munitions at a various forward locations, as well as, the subsequent costs to deploy them from these locations to the battlefield when conflict develops. Costs can be in terms of money and/or deployment time.

Secondly, we must develop target arrays for likely operational scenarios, as well as, the likelihood (probability) of each scenario.

b. Process

The process involves developing an optimization model which analyzes the weapons/munitions available, the probability of each operational scenario, and the proximity (cost) associated with deploying the necessary artillery inventory from the possible pre-position sites to each theater of operation. in order to determine the Minimum Cost (money or time).

c. Output

The follow-on study would determine the Minimum Cost (money or time), pre-deployment scheme for the future artillery inventory, in order for the artillery to best accommodate our increasing reliance upon Rapid-Deployment and Forward Presence.

APPENDIX A. AAM GAMS PROGRAM

\$TITLE ----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
 \$STITLE -- Combined Arms Army - Offensive Scenario --

----- GAMS AND DOLLAR CONTROL OPTIONS -----
 \$OFFUPPER OFFSYMXXREF OFFSYMLIST

OPTIONS SOLPRINT = OFF , LIMROW = 0, RESLIM = 10000
 OPTIONS OPTCR = 0.1 , LIMCOL = 0 , ITERLIM = 100000
 OPTIONS SYSOUT = OFF ;

----- -DEFINITIONS AND INPUT DATA -----

SET W Weapon System / HIP Improved Howitzer
 MLRS Mult Launch Rocket Sys /

M Munition Type /
 * FOR HIP:
 DPICMH HIP Dual Purp Imp Conv
 HE High Explosive
 SADARMH HIP Sense\Destroy Armor
 TGP Term Guided Proj

* FOR MLRS:
 ATACMSI Army Tac Missile(DPICM)
 ATACMSII (Longer Range)
 DPICMM MLRS Dual Purp Imp Conv
 SADARMML MLRS Sense\Destroy Armor
 TGW Term Guided Warhead /

T Target Type /
 ARTY Artillery Battery
 MRC Motorized Rifle Company
 TANK Tank Company
 TOC Reg\Div Tac Opns Center /

P Battle Phase / 1 Hour 1
 2 Hour 2
 3 Hour 3 /

R Target Range / 1 Tgt Between 0 - 30 KM Away
 2 30 - 60
 3 60 - 90
 4 90 -120 /

WCOSTS Wpn Costs / WPCOST Wpn Production Cost
WOCOSTP O\S Cost per Battle Phase
WOCOSTM O\S Cost per Msn Fired /

MCOSTS Mun Costs / MPCOST Mun Production Cost(Per Rd)
MOCOST O\S Cost per Battle Phase/ ;

ALIAS (P,I) ;

PARAMETER DISTANCE(T) # Range Bands Tgt T Moves per Phase
/ ARTY 1
MRC 1
TANK 1
TOC 0 / ;

TABLE KILPERCENT(T,R) % Tgts Type T Required Killed Range R

	Range 1	Range 2	Range 3	Range 4
ARTY	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.5
MRC	0.8	0.4	0.1	0.1
TANK	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.1
TOC	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8

TABLE NEWTGTS(T,P,R) # New Tgts Deployed Onto Battlefield
at Range R, During Phase P

Phase 1 :	Range 1	Range 2	Range 3	Range 4
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4
ARTY	9	66	9	24
MRC	9	72	9	12
TANK	27	0	27	30
TOC	0	9	6	6

Phase 2 :	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4
+				
ARTY	0	0	0	0
MRC	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0
TOC	0	0	0	0

Phase 3 :	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4
+				
ARTY	0	0	0	0
MRC	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0
TOC	0	0	0	0

TABLE EFFECTS(W,M,T) Munition Effectiveness\Lethality
 * (% Tgt T Killed\Rd)

* Weapon/Munition:	Target:			
	ARTY	MRC	TANK	TOC
HIP.DPICMH	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08
HIP.HE	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.07
HIP.SADARMH	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.10
HIP.TGP	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.12

MLRS.ATACMSI	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLRS.ATACMSII	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00
MLRS.DPICMM	0.12	0.13	0.10	0.15
MLRS.SADARMM	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.16
MLRS.TGW	0.90	0.90	0.80	1.00

TABLE FIRERATE(W,M) Wpn\Mun Long-Term Sustained
 * Rate of Fire (Rds/Phase)

* Weapon:	Munition:				
	DPICMH	SADARMH	TGP	HE	
HIP	3	3	3	3	
+					
MLRS	DPICMM 18	SADARMM 18	TGW 6	ATACMSI 6	ATACMSII 6

TABLE MAXRANGE(W,M) Max Range of Wpn\Mun Combination
 * (range band)

* Weapon:	Munition:				
	DPICMH	SADARMH	TGP	HE	
HIP	1	1	1	1	
+					
MLRS	DPICMM 2	SADARMM 2	TGW 2	ATACMSI 4	ATACMSII 4

TABLE LOSSRATE(W,M,R) Wpn Rate of Loss to Enemy Counterfire
 * (% Wpns Disabled\Destr per Rd Fired)

* Munition:	Range			
	1	2	3	4
HIP.DPICMH	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
HIP.HE	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
HIP.SADARMH	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
HIP.TGP	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00

MLRS.ATACMSI	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.01
MLRS.ATACMSII	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.01
MLRS.DPICMM	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00

MLRS.SADARM	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
MLRS.TGW	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.00

TABLE WPNCOSTS(W,W COSTS) (Thousands of Dollars)

* Weapon:		WPCOST	WOCOSTP	WOCOSTM
HIP	200	10	1	
MLRS	2000	100	10	

TABLE MUNCOSTS(M,M COSTS) (Thousands of Dollars)

* Munition:		MPCOST	MOCOST	
ATACMSI	200.0	0.5		
ATACMSII	400.0	0.5		
DPICMH	0.8	0.1		
DPICMM	5.0	0.4		
HE	0.3	0.1		
SADARMH	10.0	0.2		
SADARMM	20.0	0.4		
TGP	10.0	0.2		
TGW	100.0	0.4		;

----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----

POSITIVE VARIABLES

EXCESSM(M,P) # Mun M Remaining End Phase P

EXCESSW(W,P) # Wpn W Remaining End Phase P

TGTS(T,P,R) Total Tgts T \ Phase P \ Range R
on Battlefield (Before Losses)

* INTEGER VARIABLES

MPROD(M,P) # Mun M Produced\Resupplied for Phase P

WPROD(W,P) # Wpn W Produced\Resupplied for Phase P

X(W,M,T,P,R) # Msns Fired by All Wpn W\Mun M Combo ;
at Tgt T \ Phase P \ Range R

* SET BOUNDARIES

MPROD.LO(M,P) = 0 ;

MPROD.UP(M,P) = 400 ;

WPROD.LO(W,P) = 0 ;
WPROD.UP(W,P) = 50 ;

X.LO(W,M,T,P,R) = 0 ;
X.UP(W,M,T,P,R) = 400 ;

- * Set Model Not to Attack Targets Out of Range:
X.FX(W,M,T,P,R)\$(ORD(R) GT MAXRANGE(W,M)) = 0 ;
- * Set Model Not to Use Incompatible Wpn\Mun Combos:
X.FX(W,M,T,P,R)\$(EFFECTS(W,M,T) EQ 0) = 0 ;

VARIABLE TOTCOST Total Cost of Weapons and Munitions ;
* (Over Entire Battle)

*-----

EQUATIONS OBJ Calculate Total Cost of Wpns and Muns

NUMTGTS(T,P,R) Determine # Tgts T at Range R Phase P

MINKILLS(T,P,R) Meet Kill Crit Tgt T Phase P Range R

MAXKILLS(T,P,R) Limit Engagements to Existing Tgts

WPNPROD(W,P) Determine Wpn Prod\Resupply Requirements

MUNPROD(M,P) Determine Mun Prod\Resupply Requirements

SETEXCESSW(W,P) Determine # Wpn W Remaining End Phase P

SETEXCESSM(M,P) Determine # Mun M Remaining End Phase P ;

*-----

- * Minimize Total Cost :

OBJ.. TOTCOST =E= SUM((W,P), WPNCOSTS(W,'WPCOST') * WPROD(W,P)) +

SUM((W,P), WPNCOSTS(W,'WOCOSTP') *
(SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)), WPROD(W,I))-
SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)),SUM((M,T,R),
X(W,M,T,I,R) * LOSSRATE(W,M,R)))))) +

SUM((W,M,T,P,R), WPNCOSTS(W,'WOCOSTM') *
X(W,M,T,P,R)) +

SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MPCOST') * MPROD(M,P)) +

SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MOCOST') *
(SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),MPROD(M,I)) -
SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)), SUM((W,T,R),
X(W,M,T,I,R)))))) ;

* Subject To :

NUMTGTS(T,P,R).. TGTS(T,P,R) =E= TGTS(T,P-1,R + DISTANCE(T)) -
SUM((W,M), X(W,M,T,P-1,R + DISTANCE(T)) *
EFFECTS(W,M,T)) + NEWTGTS(T,P,R) ;

MINKILLS(T,P,R).. SUM((W,M), X(W,M,T,P,R) *
EFFECTS(W,M,T)) =G=
TGTS(T,P,R) * KILPERCENT(T,R) ;

MAXKILLS(T,P,R).. SUM((W,M), X(W,M,T,P,R) * EFFECTS(W,M,T)) =L=
TGTS(T,P,R) ;

WPNPROD(W,P).. WPROD(W,P) =G=
SUM(M\$(FIRERATE(W,M) NE 0), SUM((T,R),
X(W,M,T,P,R)/FIRERATE(W,M))) +
SUM((M,T,R), X(W,M,T,P,R) * LOSSRATE(W,M,R))-
EXCESSW(W,P-1) ;

MUNPROD(M,P).. MPROD(M,P) =G=
SUM((W,T,R), X(W,M,T,P,R)) -
EXCESSM(M,P-1) ;

SETEXCESSW(W,P).. EXCESSW(W,P) =E=
SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)), WPROD(W,I)) -
SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),
SUM((M,T,R), X(W,M,T,I,R)* LOSSRATE(W,M,R))) ;

SETEXCESSM(M,P).. EXCESSM(M,P) =E=
SUM(I\$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),
(MPROD(M,I) - SUM((W,T,R), X(W,M,T,I,R)))) ;

----- SOLVE MODEL USING RELAXED MIP -----

MODEL ARTYATTACK / ALL / ;

SOLVE ARTYATTACK USING RMIP MINIMIZING TOTCOST ;

----- GENERATE INTEGER SOLUTION BY ROUNDING RMIP SOLUTION -----

XL(W,M,T,P,R) = CEIL(XL(W,M,T,P,R)) ;
WPROD.L(W,P) = CEIL(WPROD.L(W,P)) ;
MPROD.L(M,P) = CEIL(MPROD.L(M,P)) ;

```

PARAMETER WEAPONS(*,*) ;
  WEAPONS(W,'TOTAL #') = SUM(P,WPROD.L(W,P));

PARAMETER MUNITIONS(*,*) ;
  MUNITIONS(M,'TOTAL #') = SUM(P,MPROD.L(M,P));

DISPLAY 'SOLUTION - PART I : WEAPON / MUNITION MIX:',
  WPROD.L , WEAPONS, MPROD.L , MUNITIONS ;

DISPLAY 'SOLUTION - PART II : TARGET ALLOCATION ' , X.L ;

*----- FIND TOTAL COST OF INTEGER SOLUTION -----*

SCALAR WHOLECOST ;

  WHOLECOST = SUM((W,P), WPN COSTS(W,'WPCOST') * WPROD.L(W,P)) +

    SUM((W,P), WPN COSTS(W,'WOCOSTP') *
      (SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)), WPROD.L(W,I))-
        SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)),SUM((M,T,R),
          X.L(W,M,T,I,R) * LOSSRATE(W,M,R)))))) +

    SUM((W,M,T,P,R), WPN COSTS(W,'WOCOSTM') *
      X.L(W,M,T,P,R)) +

    SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MPCOST') * MPROD.L(M,P)) +

    SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MOCOST') *
      (SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),MPROD.L(M,I)) -
        SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)), SUM((W,T,R),
          X.L(W,M,T,I,R))))))
    ;

DISPLAY 'SOLUTION - PART III : TOTAL COST : ', TOTCOST.L , WHOLECOST ;

* DETERMINE PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO SOLUTIONS:
  SCALAR DELTA ;
    DELTA = (WHOLECOST - TOTCOST.L) * 100 / TOTCOST.L ;

  DISPLAY DELTA , ' % INCREASE USING ROUNDED UP SOLUTION ' ;

```

APPENDIX B. AAM TEST CASE GAMS LISTING

```

1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS                                09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE    1
GENERAL ALGEBRAIC MODELING SYSTEM
COMPILATION

```

1
1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE 2
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
-- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --

```

4
5
6 **----- GAMS AND DOLLAR CONTROL OPTIONS
                        -----**
8
9 OPTIONS SOLPRINT = OFF , LIMROW = 0, RESLIM  = 10000
10 OPTIONS OPTCR   = 0.1 , LIMCOL = 0, ITERLIM = 100000
11 OPTIONS SYSOUT  = OFF
12
13
14 **----- -DEFINITIONS AND INPUT DATA
                        -----**
15
16 SET      W  Weapon System / HIP      Improved Howitzer
17           MLRS  Mult Launch Rocket
18           Sys /
19
20 M Munition Type /
21 *        FOR HIP:
22           DPICMH  HIP Dual Purp Imp Conv
23           HE      High Explosive
24           SADARMH HIP Sense\Destroy
25           Armor
26           TGP     Term Guided Proj
27
28 *        FOR MLRS:
29           ATACMSI  Army Tac
30           Missile(DPICM)
31           ATACMSII (Longer
32           Range)
33           DPICMM  MLRS Dual Purp Imp
34           Conv
35           SADARMM MLRS Sense\Destroy
36           Armor
37           TGW     Term Guided Warhead
38           /

```

```

32
33
34      T Target Type /
35          ARTY Artillery Battery
36          MRC Motorized Rifle Company
37          TANK Tank Company
38          TOC Reg\Div Tac Opns Center
39              /
40
41      P Battle Phase / 1 Hour 1
42          2 Hour 2
43          3 Hour 3 /
44
45      R Target Range / 1 Tgt Between 0 - 30 KM Away
46          2 30 - 60
47          3 60 - 90
48          4 90 -120
49              /
1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE 3
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
-- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --

49
50      WCOSTS Wpn Costs / WPCOST Wpn Production Cost
51          WOCOSTP O\S Cost per Battle
52              Phase
53          WOCOSTM O\S Cost per Msn
54              Fired /
55
56      MCOSTS Mun Costs / MPCOST Mun Production
57          Cost(Per Rd)
58          MOCOST O\S Cost per Battle
59              Phase/ ;
60
61      ALIAS (P,I) ;
62
63      PARAMETER DISTANCE(T) # Range Bands Tgt T Moves per
64          Phase
65          / ARTY 1
66          MRC 1
67          TANK 1
68          TOC 0 / ;
69
70      TABLE KILPERCENT(T,R) % Tgts Type T Required Killed
71          Range R
72          Range Range Range Range
73          1 2 3 4
74
75      ARTY 0.8 0.8 0.5 0.5

```


74	MRC	0.8	0.4	0.1	0.1
75	TANK	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.1
76	TOC	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8

77
78
79
80 TABLE NEWTGTS(T,P,R) # New Tgts Deployed Onto
 Battlefield
81 * at Range R, During
 Phase P

82
83 * Phase 1 : Range 1 Range 2 Range 3 Range 4
84 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4
85 ARTY 9 66 9 24
86 MRC 9 72 9 12
87 TANK 27 0 27 30
88 TOC 0 9 6 6

89
90 * Phase 2 :
91 + 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4
92 ARTY 0 0 0 0
93 MRC 0 0 0 0
94 TANK 0 0 0 0
95 TOC 0 0 0 0

1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE 4

----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----

-- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --

96
97 * Phase 3 :
98 + 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4
99 ARTY 0 0 0 0
100 MRC 0 0 0 0
101 TANK 0 0 0 0
102 TOC 0 0 0 0

103

104

105

106 TABLE EFFECTS(W,M,T) Munition
 Effectiveness\Lethality
107 * (% Tgt T Killed\Rd)

108

109 * Weapon/Munition: Target:
110 ARTY MRC TANK TOC
111 HIP.DPICMH 0.05 0.08 0.05 0.08
112 HIP.HE 0.03 0.07 0.03 0.07
113 HIP.SADARMH 0.07 0.10 0.07 0.10
114 HIP.TGP 0.08 0.12 0.08 0.12

115 * -----

116 MLRS.ATACMSI 0.80 1.00 1.00 1.00
117 MLRS.ATACMSII 0.90 1.00 1.00 1.00
118 MLRS.DPICMM 0.12 0.13 0.10 0.15
119 MLRS.SADARMM 0.13 0.15 0.12 0.16
120 MLRS.TGW 0.90 0.90 0.80 1.00

```

121
122
123
124 TABLE      FIRERATE(W,M)   Wpn\Mun Long-Term Sustained
125 *              Rate of Fire (Rds/Phase)
126
127 *      Weapon:      Munition:
128              DPICMH  SADARMH  TGP   HE
129              HIP    3      3    3    3
130
131      +      DPICMM  SADARMM  TGW  ATACMSI  ATACMSII
132      MLRS    18      18    6    6      6
133
134
135
136 TABLE      MAXRANGE(W,M)   Max Range of Wpn\Mun Combination
137 *              (range band)
138
139 *      Weapon:      Munition:
140              DPICMH  SADARMH  TGP   HE
141              HIP    1      1    1    1
142
143      +      DPICMM  SADARMM  TGW  ATACMSI  ATACMSII
144      MLRS    2      2    2    4      4
145
146
147
148 TABLE      LOSSRATE(W,M,R)   Wpn Rate of Loss to Enemy
                                   Counterfire
1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS                      09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE    5
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
-- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --

149 *              (% Wpns Disabled\Destr per Rd
                                   Fired)
150
151 *      Munition:      Range      Range      Range      Range
152              1          2          3          4
153      HIP.DPICMH      0.04      0.00      0.00      0.00
154      HIP.HE          0.04      0.00      0.00      0.00
155      HIP.SADARMH     0.04      0.00      0.00      0.00
156      HIP.TGP         0.04      0.00      0.00      0.00
157 *      -----
158      MLRS.ATACMSI    0.10      0.05      0.01      0.01
159      MLRS.ATACMSII   0.10      0.05      0.01      0.01
160      MLRS.DPICMM     0.02      0.01      0.00      0.00
161      MLRS.SADARMM    0.02      0.01      0.00      0.00
162      MLRS.TGW        0.10      0.05      0.00      0.00
163
164
165
166 TABLE      WPNCOSTS(W,W COSTS) (Thousands of Dollars)
167
168 *      Weapon:

```

```

169          WPCOST      WOCOSTP      WOCOSTM
170      HIP          200          10          1
171
172      MLRS          2000          100          10
173
174
175
176 TABLE          MUNCOSTS(M,MCOSTS) (Thousands of Dollars)
177
178 *      Munition:
179          MPCOST      MOCOST
180      ATACMSI 200.0      0.5
181      ATACMSII 400.0      0.5
182      DPICMH 0.8      0.1
183      DPICMM 5.0      0.4
184      HE 0.3      0.1
185      SADARMH 10.0      0.2
186      SADARMM 20.0      0.4
187      TGP 10.0      0.2
188      TGW 100.0      0.4      ;
189
190
191
192 **----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL
193          -----**
194
195 POSITIVE
196 VARIABLES
197      EXCESSM(M,P) # Mun M Remaining End Phase P
198
199      EXCESSW(W,P) # Wpn W Remaining End Phase P
200
201      TGTS(T,P,R) Total Tgts T \ Phase P \ Range R
1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE 6
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
-- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --

202 *      on Battlefield (Before Losses)
203 INTEGER
204 VARIABLES
205      MPROD(M,P) # Mun M Produced\Resupplied for
206                  Phase P
207
208      WPROD(W,P) # Wpn W Produced\Resupplied for
209                  Phase P
210
211      X(W,M,T,P,R) # Msns Fired by All Wpn W\Mun M
212                  Combo ;
213 *      at Tgt T \ Phase P \ Range R
214
215 * SET BOUNDARIES
216      MPROD.LO(M,P) = 0 ;
217      MPROD.UP(M,P) = 400 ;

```

```

215
216      WPROD.LO(W,P) = 0      ;
217      WPROD.UP(W,P) = 50      ;
218
219      X.LO(W,M,T,P,R) = 0      ;
220      X.UP(W,M,T,P,R) = 400    ;
221
222 *      Set Model Not to Attack Targets Out of Range:
223      X.FX(W,M,T,P,R)$(ORD(R) GT MAXRANGE(W,M)) = 0
                ;
224 *      Set Model Not to Use Incompatible Wpn\Mun Combos:
225      X.FX(W,M,T,P,R)$(EFFECTS(W,M,T) EQ 0) = 0
                ;
226
227 VARIABLE      TOTCOST      Total Cost of Weapons and
                        Munitions ;
228 *                        (Over Entire Battle)
229
230 *-----
231
232 EQUATIONS      OBJ      Calculate Total Cost of Wpns and
                        Muns
233
234      NUMTGTS(T,P,R) Determine # Tgts T at Range R
                        Phase P
235
236      MINKILLS(T,P,R) Meet Kill Crit Tgt T Phase P
                        Range R
237
238      MAXKILLS(T,P,R) Limit Engagements to Existing Tgts
239
240      WPNPROD(W,P) Determine Wpn Prod\Resupply
                        Requirements
241
242      MUNPROD(M,P) Determine Mun Prod\Resupply
                        Requirements
243
244      SETEXCESSW(W,P) Determine # Wpn W Remaining End
                        Phase P
1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS      09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE      7
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
-- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --

245
246      SETEXCESSM(M,P) Determine # Mun M Remaining End
                        Phase P ;
247
248
249
250
251 *-----
252
253 * Minimize Total Cost :
254

```

```

255  OBJ..  TOTCOST =E= SUM((W,P), WPNCOSTS(W,'WPCOST') *
                                WPROD(W,P)) +
256
257      SUM((W,P), WPNCOSTS(W,'WOCOSTP') *
258      (SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)), WPROD(W,I))-
259      SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)),SUM((M,T,R),
260      X(W,M,T,I,R) * LOSSRATE(W,M,R)))))) +
261
262      SUM((W,M,T,P,R), WPNCOSTS(W,'WOCOSTM') *
263      X(W,M,T,P,R)) +
264
265      SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MPCOST') *
                                MPROD(M,P)) +
266
267      SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MOCOST') *
268      (SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),MPROD(M,I)) -
269      SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)), SUM((W,T,R)
270
271      X(W,M,T,I,R))))))
272
273  * Subject To :
274
275
276  NUMTGTS(T,P,R)..  TGTS(T,P,R) =E= TGTS(T,P-1,R +
                                DISTANCE(T)) -
277      SUM((W,M), X(W,M,T,P-1,R + DISTANCE(T)
278      ) *
279      EFFECTS(W,M,T)) + NEWTGTS(T,P,R)
280
281
282  MINKILLS(T,P,R)..  SUM((W,M), X(W,M,T,P,R) *
283      EFFECTS(W,M,T)) =G=
284      TGTS(T,P,R) * KILPERCENT(T,R)
285
286
287  MAXKILLS(T,P,R)..  SUM((W,M), X(W,M,T,P,R) * EFFECTS(W,M,T)
288      ) =L=
289      TGTS(T,P,R)
290
291
292  WPNPROD(W,P)..  WPROD(W,P) =G=
293      SUM(M$(FIRERATE(W,M) NE 0), SUM((T,R),
294      X(W,M,T,P,R)/FIRERATE(W,M)))) +
295      SUM((M,T,R), X(W,M,T,P,R) *
296      LOSSRATE(W,M,R))-

```



```

294          EXCESSW(W,P-1)
                                           ;
295
296
297  MUNPROD(M,P)..  MPROD(M,P) = G =
298          SUM((W,T,R), X(W,M,T,P,R)) -
299          EXCESSM(M,P-1)
                                           ;
300
301
302  SETEXCESSW(W,P)..  EXCESSW(W,P) = E =
303          SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)), WPROD(W,I))
304          -
305          SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),
306          SUM((M,T,R), X(W,M,T,I,R))*
307          LOSSRATE(W,M,R))) ;
308
309
310  SETEXCESSM(M,P)..  EXCESSM(M,P) = E =
311          SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),
312          (MPROD(M,I) - SUM((W,T,R),
313          X(W,M,T,I,R)))) ;
314
315
316
317  *----- SOLVE MODEL USING RELAXED MIP
318          -----*
319
320  MODEL ARTYATTACK / ALL /
321
322  SOLVE ARTYATTACK USING RMIP MINIMIZING TOTCOST ;
323
324
325  *---- GENERATE INTEGER SOLUTION BY ROUNDING RMIP SOLUTION
326          -----*
327
328  XL(W,M,T,P,R) = CEIL(XL(W,M,T,P,R)) ;
329  WPROD.L(W,P) = CEIL(WPROD.L(W,P)) ;
330  MPROD.L(M,P) = CEIL(MPROD.L(M,P)) ;
331
332  PARAMETER WEAPONS(*,*) ;
333  WEAPONS(W,'TOTAL #') = SUM(P,WPROD.L(W,P));
334
335  PARAMETER MUNITIONS(*,*) ;
336  MUNITIONS(M,'TOTAL #') = SUM(P,MPROD.L(M,P));
337
338  1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS          09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE    9
339  ----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
340  -- COMBINED ARMS ARMY - OFFENSIVE SCENARIO --
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400

```

```

337  DISPLAY 'SOLUTION - PART I : WEAPON / MUNITION MIX:',
338      WPROD.L , WEAPONS, MPROD.L , MUNITIONS ;
339
340
341  DISPLAY 'SOLUTION - PART II : TARGET ALLOCATION ' , X.L ;
342
343
344  *----- FIND TOTAL COST OF INTEGER SOLUTION
          -----*
345
346  SCALAR WHOLECOST  ;
347
348      WHOLECOST = SUM((W,P), WPN COSTS(W,'WPCOST') * WPROD.L(W,P))
          +
349
350          SUM((W,P), WPN COSTS(W,'WOCOSTP') *
351              (SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)), WPROD.L(W,I))-
352              SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)),SUM((M,T,R),
353              X.L(W,M,T,I,R) * LOSSRATE(W,M,R)))))) +
354
355          SUM((W,M,T,P,R), WPN COSTS(W,'WOCOSTM') *
356          X.L(W,M,T,P,R)) +
357
358          SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MPCOST') *
          MPROD.L(M,P)) +
359
360          SUM((M,P), MUNCOSTS(M,'MOCOST') *
361              (SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE ORD(P)),MPROD.L(M,I)) -
362              SUM(I$(ORD(I) LE (ORD(P)-1)), SUM((W,T,R)
          ,
363          X.L(W,M,T,I,R))))))
          ;
364
365
366  DISPLAY 'SOLUTION - PART III : TOTAL COST : ', TOTCOST.L ,
          WHOLECOST ;
367
368
369  * DETERMINE PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO SOLUTIONS:
370      SCALAR DELTA ;
371      DELTA = (WHOLECOST - TOTCOST.L) * 100 / TOTCOST.L ;
372
373  DISPLAY DELTA , ' % INCREASE USING ROUNDED UP SOLUTION ' ;
374

```

```

COMPILATION TIME      =      0.310 SECONDS
1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS      09/10/91 20:22:31 PAGE    10
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
MODEL STATISTICS      SOLVE ARTYATTACK USING RMIP FROM LINE 319

```

MODEL STATISTICS

BLOCKS OF EQUATIONS 8 SINGLE EQUATIONS 211
BLOCKS OF VARIABLES 7 SINGLE VARIABLES 979
NON ZERO ELEMENTS 5744 DISCRETE VARIABLES 249

GENERATION TIME = 2.290 SECONDS

EXECUTION TIME = 2.470 SECONDS

1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:43 PAGE 11

----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----

SOLUTION REPORT SOLVE ARTYATTACK USING RMIP FROM LINE 319

S O L V E S U M M A R Y

MODEL ARTYATTACK OBJECTIVE TOTCOST
TYPE RMIP DIRECTION MINIMIZE
SOLVER ZOOM FROM LINE 319

**** SOLVER STATUS 1 NORMAL COMPLETION
**** MODEL STATUS 1 OPTIMAL
**** OBJECTIVE VALUE 130805.9741

RESOURCE USAGE, LIMIT 1.346 10000.000
ITERATION COUNT, LIMIT 218 100000

Z O O M / X M P --- Version 2.1 Jun 1988

Courtesy of Dr Roy E. Marsten,
Department of Management Information Systems,
University of Arizona,
Tucson Arizona 85721, U.S.A.

PROBLEM SPECIFICATIONS

BEGIN

*
* number of hot LP bases saved during B&B
MAX SAVE 30
* control order of branching 1, 2, or 3
ORDER 1
* number of attractive nonbasic var.
* saved during major iter.
MULTIPLE 30
* relative gap between opt int. ans and LP ans.
*GAP 0.5
*INCUMBENT = 0.215495
* how often to reinvert basis
INVERT = 10
* control amount of printing
PRINT LP1 1
PRINT BRANCH 0

*
END

Work space needed (estimate) -- 31855 words.
Work space available -- 31855 words.
Maximum obtainable -- 291069 words.

The LU factors occupied 747 slots (estimate 7464).

1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:43 PAGE 12
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
SOLUTION REPORT SOLVE ARTYATTACK USING RMIP FROM LINE 319

**** REPORT SUMMARY : 0 NONOPT
0 INFEASIBLE
0 UNBOUNDED

1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:43 PAGE 13
----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
E X E C U T I N G

---- 337 SOLUTION - PART I : WEAPON / MUNITION MIX:

---- 337 VARIABLE WPROD.L # WPN W PRODUCED\RESUPPLIED FOR
PHASE P

1

HIP 23.000
MLRS 38.000

---- 337 PARAMETER WEAPONS

TOTAL #

HIP 23.000
MLRS 38.000

---- 337 VARIABLE MPROD.L # MUN M PRODUCED\RESUPPLIED FOR
PHASE P

1 2 3

DPICMH		54.000	48.000
TGP	60.000		
ATACMSI	68.000	19.000	1.000
DPICMM		231.000	33.000
TGW	106.000	36.000	29.000

---- 337 PARAMETER MUNITIONS

TOTAL #

DPICMH	102.000
TGP	60.000
ATACMSI	88.000
DPICMM	264.000
TGW	171.000

---- 341 SOLUTION - PART II : TARGET ALLOCATION
 1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:43 PAGE 14
 ----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----
 E X E C U T I N G

---- 341 VARIABLE X.L # MSNS FIRED BY ALL WPN W\MUN M
 COMBO

INDEX 1 = HIP INDEX 2 = DPICMH

1

MRC .2	54.000
MRC .3	48.000

INDEX 1 = HIP INDEX 2 = TGP

1

MRC .1	60.000
--------	--------

INDEX 1 = MLRS INDEX 2 = ATACMSI

1 3 4

ARTY.1		6.000	15.000
ARTY.2		8.000	
MRC .1		1.000	2.000
MRC .2		2.000	
TANK.1	25.000	9.000	3.000
TANK.2		9.000	
TOC .1		5.000	5.000
TOC .2		1.000	1.000
TOC .3		1.000	1.000

INDEX 1 = MLRS INDEX 2 = DPICMM

1 2

MRC .2	222.000	
MRC .3	1.000	30.000
TOC .2		10.000
TOC .3		2.000

INDEX 1 = MLRS INDEX 2 = TGW

	1	2
ARTY.1	8.000	59.000
ARTY.2	12.000	4.000
ARTY.3	1.000	6.000
MRC .1		32.000
MRC .2	2.000	4.000
TANK.2		15.000
TANK.3	9.000	15.000
TOC .1		8.000

---- 366 SOLUTION - PART III : TOTAL COST :

1GAMS 2.19 IBM CMS 09/10/91 20:22:43 PAGE 15

----- ARTILLERY ATTACK MODEL -----

E X E C U T I N G

---- 366 VARIABLE TOTCOST.L = 130805.974 TOTAL COST
OF WEAPONS
AND MUNITIONS
PARAMETER WHOLECOST = 132586.600

---- 373 PARAMETER DELTA

= 1.361 % INCREASE USING ROUNDED UP SOLUTION

**** FILE SUMMARY FOR USER 8876P

INPUT AAM5 GAMS A
OUTPUT AAM5 LISTING A

EXECUTION TIME = 0.460 SECONDS

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Headquarters, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, Pamphlet 525-5B (Coordinating Draft), *AirLand Operations - The Evolution of AirLand Operations for a Strategic Army*, p. 7, April 1991.
2. U.S. Army Field Artillery School, Directorate of Combat Developments, *Legal Mix VII Study - Field Artillery Operations in Support of AirLand Battle Future*, p. 5-2, March 1991.
3. The discussion of future artillery systems is based upon Anderson, E.G., "Reshaping the Field Artillery," *Field Artillery Journal*, June 1991.
4. The Artillery Attack Model is based upon Wroth, MAJ M., *The Long Range Fires Attack Model - Proof of Principle, Prototype Model*, U.S. Army Field Artillery School, Fort Sill, Oklahoma, December 1990. MAJ Wroth's model is a small-scale prototype intended to demonstrate that Linear Programming (LP) has the potential to be applied to the weapons/munitions mix problem. This study is being conducted to develop a full-scale working LP model for DCD, USAFAS to use to solve the weapons/munitions composition and allocation problem.
5. Heterogeneous Aggregation and aspects of aggregated modeling are discussed by Hartman, J.K., *Aggregated Combat Modeling*, ch. 2, Naval Postgraduate School, 1985.
6. Brooke, A., Kendrick, D., and Meeraus, A., *GAMS - A User's Guide*, The Scientific Press, 1988.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, COL E. G., "Reshaping the Field Artillery," *Field Artillery Journal*, June 1991.

Brooke, A., Kendrick, D., and Meeraus, A., *GAMS - A User's Guide*, The Scientific Press, 1988.

Brown, LTG F.J., "AirLand Battle Future - The Other Side of The Coin," *Military Review*, February 1991.

Department of the Army, Field Manual 100-2-1, *The Soviet Army - Operations and Tactics*, July 1984.

Department of the Army, Field Manual 100-2-3, *The Soviet Army - Troops, Organization and Equipment*, July 1984.

Foss, GEN J.W., "AirLand Battle Future - Advent of the Nonlinear Battlefield," *Army Magazine*, February 1991.

Hartman, J.K., *Aggregated Combat Modeling*, Naval Postgraduate School, 1985.

Headquarters, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, Pamphlet 525-5B (Coordinating Draft), *AirLand Operations - The Evolution of AirLand Operations For a Strategic Army*, April 1991.

Jackson, MAJ J.A., *A Taxonomy of Advanced Linear Programming Techniques and The Theater Attack Model*, Master's Thesis, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, March 1989.

Laferriere, R.R. and Kolding, MAJ J., *Armor Anti-Armor Mix Methodology, Optimization Model*, TRADOC Analysis Command - White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, April 1991.

Ludvigsen, E.C., "Future Combat Systems - A Status Report," *Army Magazine*, February 1991.

Silvasy, MG S., "AirLand Battle Future - The Tactical Battlefield," *Military Review*, February 1991.

U.S. Army Field Artillery School, Directorate of Combat Developments, *Legal Mix VII Study - Field Artillery Operations in Support of AirLand Battle Future*, March 1991.

- Wroth, MAJ M., *The Long Range Fires Attack Model - Proof of Principle, Prototype Model*, U.S. Army Field Artillery School, Fort Sill, Oklahoma, December 1990.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Defense Technical Information Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, VA 22304-6145 | 2 |
| 2. | Library, Code 52
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5002 | 2 |
| 3 | Deputy Undersecretary of the Army
for Operations Research
Room 2E621, Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310 | 1 |
| 4. | Director
U.S. Army TRADOC Analysis Command-WSMR
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502 | 1 |
| 5. | Commander
U.S. Army Field Artillery School
ATTN: ATSF-CCL (MAJ WROTH)
Fort Sill, OK 73503 | 2 |
| 6. | Bell Hall Library
U.S. Army Combined Arms Center
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027 | 1 |
| 7. | LCDR William Walsh, Code OR/Wa
Department of Operations Research
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5000 | 1 |
| 8. | LTC William Caldwell, Code OR/Cw
Department of Operations Research
Naval Postgraduate school
Monterey, CA 93943-5000 | 1 |
| 9. | CPT John Mann Page
5802 Westcott Hills Way
Alexandria, VA 22310 | 4 |

Thesis

P116415 Page

c.1 The optimal force mix
 and allocation of fires
 for the future field
 artillery.

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY



3 2768 00036345 1